

Collaborative Partner Review

Operational Guidance Notes

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Informing of Partner Review.....	3
Introductory Meeting.....	3
Further Planning Meetings.....	3
Appointment of External Advisers (EAs).....	3
Required Documentation.....	4
Agenda and Event Preparation.....	4
The Review Event.....	4
Post Event and Outcomes.....	4
Guidance for Panel Members.....	5
Appendix One: Agenda Template.....	7
Appendix Two: Information Required for Self-Evaluation Document (SED).....	8

Partner Review: Guidance Notes for Partner Review Stakeholders

Introduction

Partner review is a process used to review academic collaborative partnerships to confirm that they continue to operate well, that the quality and standards are good, and that the partnership should remain in continuing approval. Partners are subject to partner review after the first three years of operation and then every five years, although London Met reserves the right to instigate a partner review at any point during the lifetime of a partnership. Franchised courses are subject to internal review and therefore course content would not be reviewed as part of the partner review process.

The Academic Quality and Development (AQD) team have put together the following guidance notes which will focus on the operational aspects of the review process.

Informing of Partner Review

The Collaborative Partnerships Committee (CPC) and relevant Schools will be informed of the partner review schedule in the academic year prior to the partner review taking place. Once confirmed, an AQD Partnerships Officer will contact School colleagues to establish stakeholder details and commence planning for the Introductory Meeting. AQD will convene a partner review panel.

Introductory Meeting

The introductory meeting will take place in the semester prior to the partner review and is an opportunity for the relevant staff from London Met to meet with the Partner staff to discuss the purpose of the review, the role of the Partner Institution and London Met School(s) in the review, agree logistics and the identification of issues that may impact on the review. This will be an informal meeting and will involve the following:

- Relevant staff from the collaborative partner
- London Met Academic Liaison Tutor, School Head of Collaborative Partnerships
- A representative from the Partnerships Office
- Relevant staff from AQD
- Any other staff which the Partner or London Met consider should attend the meeting.

AQD will plan and arrange this meeting.

Further Planning Meetings

Partner colleagues and London Met School staff may arrange subsequent meetings to plan for the review documentation. Such meetings may consider progress on the self evaluation document and the types of evidence required to support the review. Further meetings with AQD may be arranged if this would be helpful to clarify or explain aspects of the review.

Appointment of External Advisers (EAs)

At the beginning of the process, School staff may be required to seek appropriate External Adviser(s) for the partner review. A minimum of two per review is suggested, though this maybe increased or reduced if the context of the review warrants it. AQD will ensure the suitability of any nomination and approve the EAs and the partner will be consulted to ensure there is no conflict of interest.

In making judgments about the suitability of the proposed EA, AQD takes into account the overall balance of expertise presented by the EA. AQD may reject a nominee or require an additional EA to

be sought in order to ensure the balance of the panel.

Required Documentation

A Self-Evaluation Document (SED) will be required and it is expected that this will be jointly completed by the Partner and London Met; where more than one School is involved each School's input will need to be clearly defined within the SED. Guidance on how to complete the SED and the required supporting documents can found [here](#).

The supporting documentation list must be made available to the panel so that it can be considered as part of the review. The AQD Officer will be responsible for sharing any documents with the panel. Where possible, documents should be submitted at least six weeks in advance of the review event. In most cases, arrangements for the provision of the documents will be with the Collaborative Partner/London Met School Staff, although in some cases AQD will be able to provide the documents, such as the Course Specification and the IMoA / CLAs. If necessary, more detailed discussion on the provision of documents can be agreed at the Further Planning Meeting.

Agenda and Event Preparation

A standard event agenda will be disseminated to all key stakeholders (appendix one) prior to the event. All panel members are required to read the submitted documentation before the event; this will have been made available by the AQD Officer. The AQD Officer will arrange a private panel meeting where the Chair will establish the lines of enquiry from panel members, finalise the agenda and agree the themes and questions to be asked and by whom during the event.

The Review Event

The partner review process is normally conducted over a period of one to two days, depending on the scale of the provision that is to be considered as part of the review and taking into account time differences for overseas partners. It would usually take place at the premises of the collaborative partner, however, the event may be a virtual event and conducted over a platform such as MS Teams or it may be a hybrid event with some members of the panel being in attendance at the partner's delivery location with other members of the panel joining by MS Teams; this will be decided early on in the process in consultation with the Partner, London Met and by reviewing Government travel guidance at the time.

The review would usually include a meeting with students, a tour of the physical resources available to support the partnership and meetings with staff from both London Met and the Partner Institution to discuss the various aspects of the partnership.

The meeting with students should include existing students and may also include graduates. Only the formal panel will attend the meeting with students.

At the end of the event the Chair will feedback to the partner and London Met staff on behalf of the panel on the outcomes as determined by the panel and explain any conditions and or recommendations.

Post Event and Outcomes

Post event, the AQD Officer will send out a confirmation email of the formal outcomes within a day or two of the event. The final report will be completed and once agreed by panel members, the report

will be shared with the partner for their information. The report will be formally considered through London Met's governance structure via CPC and also received at the School level Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

It is required that Schools and the Partner Institution work together to ensure any conditions are met by the deadline. The formal response to conditions should be sent to the AQD Officer for consideration.

The Collaborative Partner and School staff will prepare an action plan based on the outcomes of the review process, which will include updates on progress with any recommendations set, and this will be monitored through CPC.

Following consideration of the partner review report, the Head of the Partnerships Office will be informed of the outcomes and will write to the partner institution to confirm the period for which the courses will be reapproved and issue relevant legal documents for signature .

Guidance for Panel Members

The role of the Chair of the Panel

The following is the role of the Chair with reference to the Partner Review:

- To attend planning meetings and guide discussions around the documents submitted, responses received to panel feedback and determining lines of enquiry for the review itself
- Along with the Panel, review all documentation that will be made available at least three weeks prior to the agreed event date
- To be available to attend a private panel meeting before the event commences and lead discussions for setting and agreeing specific questions raised by panel members from the documentation received.
- To attend the event and lead the panel, ensuring relevant questions are posed and the agenda is carried out. The event maybe a virtual or physical event and this will be decided early on in the process in consultation with the Partner, London Met and by following Government guidance at the time. It is expected the Chair will lead the event in either circumstance.
- To feed back to the Partner and London Met staff at the end of the event on behalf of the panel; this feedback will conclude if the Partnership will continue and if there are any conditions and or recommendations.
- Together with the AQD Officer, the Chair will establish whether the conditions from the event have been met and feedback to the Partner and London Met staff on the outcome. If the conditions are still not met, a further response will be required.

The role of Panel Members

The following is the role of a Panel Member (ie External Adviser, internal panel member, Student representative) with reference to the Partner Review:

- Along with other panel members, review all documentation that will be made available at least three weeks prior to the agreed event date.
- To be available to attend a private panel meeting before the event commences and feedback to the Chair your comments and any specific questions you would like to raise at the event.

- To attend the event, whether this is physical or virtual and raise your questions as agreed with the Chair and Panel at the planning meeting.
- Contribute to 'private panel meetings' held throughout the event and feed into the final feedback the Chair will give to the Partner and London Met School staff.
- Confirm the final report when requested to do so.

Appendix One: Agenda Template

London Metropolitan University

Partner Review with (name of Partner)

(Date of meeting)

AGENDA

Time	Scheduled activity
	Introductions
	Presentation by Partner representatives on the current profile of the institution, the strategic direction and plans for growth of H.E. collaborative provision (if any).
	Tour of physical resources available that support the partnership. (This may be a video of the resources and demo of the VLE)
	Meeting with some current students and alumni on existing courses; (Courses represented to be listed)
	Meeting with partner teaching staff and ALTs (Courses represented to be listed)
	Lunch break
	Discussion of key points and main issues with Partner & School representatives as follows: (points to be listed)
	University private meeting
	Conclusions and feedback to School & Partner representatives, noting one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Approve the continuing collaborative partnership and delivery of the course(s) without conditions;- Approve the continuing collaborative partnership and delivery of the course(s) with conditions and/or recommendations;- Withhold approval.
	Close.

Appendix Two: Information Required for Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

Name of Partner	
London Met School(s)	
Location(s) of Delivery	
Provision Delivered	
Report completed by	

Please include the following in the SED:

- Describe the collaborative partnership including a summary and explanation of the development of the partnership over the period under review;
- Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership;
- Summarise any issues raised about the quality and operation of the partnership during the period being reviewed and how these have been addressed;
- Provide a view of the effectiveness of the means by which London Met Schools assure themselves of the quality of the learning opportunities and student support offered through the partnership;
- Provide a view of the effectiveness of the means by which the London Met Schools assure themselves of the standards of credits and/or awards gained through the partnership;
- Consider and evaluate student outcomes on the courses under review – this includes continuation rates and graduate outcomes and could also include an analysis of differentiated outcomes by equality characteristics such as gender and students identified as having a disability or difficulty which impacts on learning;
- Identify any other issues which the course team's own evaluation of the partnership has raised and how these are to be addressed;
- Address any external developments which have affected, or will affect, the partnership;
- Provide an index of the evidence that it cites and that will be available to the review team.

Supporting document list:

- Course guides/student handbook(s) for every course under review;
- Course specification for every course;
- Report from the previous approval/review event;
- London Met Annual/Continuous monitoring reports and action plans for the three previous years;
- External examiner's reports and responses for the three previous years;
- Evidence of student voice activity, such as course committee meetings, and outcomes and actions from any internal or external student feedback mechanisms;
- Details of staff development activity – both within the collaborative partner and between London Met and the partner;
- Reports by any external regulatory visits, including professional bodies (where appropriate);
- Student data – both intake data, as well as outcomes data such as continuation and completion data covering the last three intakes;
- A description of student support/wellbeing services at the partner and, where appropriate, at London Met, plus any recent analysis of student use, subject to normal constraints of confidentiality in respect of counselling and similar activities;
- Some analysis of student data and outcomes for the last three years (taken from assessment board data, where available)
- Marking and feedback sheets/templates and assessment criteria / rubrics;
- Examples of students' work to reflect the range of levels and attainment – including examination papers/scripts, coursework, project/lab reports scripts, project reports and dissertation;
- ALT reports for the last three years for all courses run with the partner;
- Any other documentation referenced in the self-evaluation document.